

then. We look in vain for the formation of a public sentiment against licentiousness on heathen ground, when the church herself refuses to lend her influence to form such a sentiment at home. O when will the church be consistent? O when will she see the necessity, the absolute necessity, of taking as bold a stand against lewdness, as against intemperance? We are much comforted in the belief, and it is almost the only comfort we have on this subject, that the day is coming when the churches must and will come up to this work. Then, what minister, what male professor will not be ashamed that he stood aloof from this sharpest conflict with the kingdom of darkness, till females, timid females led the way, and by their example, did what they could to inspire the bosoms of the bold soldiers of the cross with courage to face the enemy. And if in the millennium there is any one thing for which the church will blush, it will be at the recollection that there was a time, when in a direct attack upon a giant vice, the men retired from the field of battle, and left the contest to be waged for more than an entire year, by weak and defenceless females. *Advocate of Moral Reform.*

POPERY.

Purgatory.—The following statement and illustrations of the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory are extracted from the *Pittsburgh Herald*. Nothing can be more incontrovertible than the fact, that if the Romish purgatory be a reality then Roman Priests, as Paul describes them; "covetous, without natural affection, and fierce;" 2 Timothy 3; 1-5; and if it be, as it self-evidently is, only a Popish "lying wonder," then Peter's prediction is fulfilled in them; "through covetousness with feigned words do they make merchandise" of the silly sheep, felled ten thousand times before. 2 Peter 2. 1-3.

From the Protestant Vindicator.

Every Papist professes to believe "that there is a purgatory. The torment suffered there is great, according to some, as great while it lasts as the torment of hell. The priest professes to have the power of delivering the poor soul, by saying a few masses. A man dies and goes there. The man was a member of his flock, who never did him any harm, who paid all his dues &c.; but now he is in purgatory. His wife believing that the priest has power to deliver him, applies for the necessary assistance. The priest replies, 'Yes, I have the power, but before I exercise it, give me the money.' She has it not. He pictures to her imagination all the horrors of his sufferings. In fancy she sees him writhe; she hears him groan; and yet the cold calculating Papist refuses to do any thing to allay her sufferings till he receives her money. If the doctrine of purgatory be true, the priest is a monster. If false, he receives the money knowing it to be false, he is a villain."

"A few years ago in a neighboring country, a Papist in indigent circumstances died. After his burial, his wife went to the priest, and made inquiry about the probable state of her deceased husband. She was informed that he was in purgatory! The priest immediately urged her to have him released from his pitiable condition, and offered his services for the accomplishment of the desirable object. She informed him that the only property she possessed was a horse and a cow, and that she had a family to support. She made an offer of the horse, if the priest would perform the benevolent office. 'Poor deluded creature!' 'He told her he would try, perhaps he could succeed for the proposed offer. But after some time, he returned, and told the sorrowing widow, that he could not release him for the proposed amount, and insisted that she should give the cow also. The woman after a long struggle between the prospects of her poor children and suffering husband, concluded to consider the matter a few days. In the meantime, she concluded that it would be better for her husband to suffer a little longer in purgatory, as he was partly released by the prayers of the priest, than that her children should suffer."

From the Protestant Vindicator. CHALLENGE.

The Roman Prelate and Priests of Montreal, Messrs Conroy, Quarter, and Schneller, of New York—Messrs Fenwick and Byrne of Boston—Mr Hughes of Philadelphia—the Arch Prelate of Baltimore, and his subordinate Priests—and Cardinal England of Charleston, with all other Roman Priests, and every Nun, from Baffin's bay to the gulf of Mexico, are hereby challenged to meet an investigation of the truth of Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," before an impartial assembly, over which shall preside seven gentlemen; three to be selected by the Roman Priests, three by the Executive Committee of the New York Protestant Association, and the seventh as Chairman, to be chosen by the six.

An eligible place in New York shall be appointed, and the regulations for the decorum and order of the meetings, with all the other arrangements, shall be made by the above gentlemen.

All communications upon this subject from any of the Roman Priests or Nuns, either individually or as delegates for their superiors, addressed to the Corresponding Secretary of the New York Protestant Association, No. 142 Nassau street, New York, will be promptly answered.

Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it.—Solomon.

ORIGIN OF THE NEW YORK DISCUSSION.

This Discussion, which has produced in this city such an unparalleled excitement about the Scriptures, and which was conducted for twenty-eight evenings in the presence of thousands, arose out of the following circumstance.

Dr Sleigh, professor of anatomy, and surgery, &c. &c. while delivering, last October, a course of lectures on physiology and the laws of life in the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, took occasion to observe that the laws of nature, so far from militating against the truth of the Scriptures, as Infidels generally suppose they do, powerfully corroborate them; and that it is only a superficial knowledge of nature which leads any man to imagine that her laws contradict the Bible. A few other observations similar to the above, appeared quite sufficient to excite the spirit and arouse the pride of the Infidels of Philadelphia who hold meetings every Sunday in Military Hall to revile the Living God.

Accordingly they invited the Doctor to deliver his Lectures in a place where they would have an opportunity of replying to them; or in plain English, to a public debate. The Doctor assented. A large room was taken for the purpose—regulations were entered into between the parties—Moderators were chosen—and on the 18th day of October, 1835, the Discussion commenced. Mr Camfield, editor of the Temple of Reason, Mr Bural a member of the bar, and Mr Purser of New York, appeared on the platform, as the champions of Infidelity:—Dr Sleigh as the advocate and defender of the Scriptures. The debate was carried on for six nights, and terminated in a manner the following resolution sufficiently explains.

CHRISTIANITY VICTORIOUS.—At an over-crowded meeting held on the 30th inst. in the Temperance Hall, Northern Exchange, the following resolution was carried unanimously, and with enthusiastic applause:

"Resolved, That after six nights public discussion between Dr Sleigh in defence of Divine Revelation, and the Representatives of the New York and Philadelphia Free Inquirers, in support of Infidelity, it has been satisfactorily proved that genuine Christianity is of divine origin, and that the attacks made by Infidels on the Sacred Scriptures, are as frivolous as they are unsupported by reason and common sense, and destructive to the best interests of mankind."—[Nem. Con.]

The reverse was then put, and not a single hand was held up to support it.

(Signed) R. H. CLOE, JOHN STEEL, JNO MARTIN, F. D. W. WARD, THOS. BROWN, Philadelphia, October, 30, 1835.

This discussion in Philadelphia had not actually terminated, ere the Infidels of New York invited the Doctor to this city, to meet them before the public. Therefore, as soon as the above Discussion had ended, the Doctor came off to this city.—The Infidels assembling in Tammany Hall, under the name of "Moral Philanthropists," appointed two gentlemen as their representatives or delegates, whose appointment was communicated to the Doctor, by the following document.

New York, Nov. 4th, 1835. The undersigned, as Trustees of the Society of Moral Philanthropists, do hereby nominate and appoint Mr Benjamin Offen, and Mr G. H. Purser to be their delegates to confer with Dr W. W. Sleigh, relative to any Theological Discussion, and to make such arrangements with him on behalf of this Society, as they may deem proper for conducting the same.

(Signed) THOS. WOODWARD, Chairman. JOHN WOODS, Secretary. JOE DITCHETT, Treasurer.

Accordingly the New York discussion commenced in the Euterpean Hall, Broadway, on Thursday evening Nov. 12th 1835, and was carried on for fifteen nights in the presence of thousands; when such was the interest excited that it became necessary to have the police in regular attendance each evening. Mr Offen withdrew after the fifth night's debate, on the plea that the Doctor turned his arguments into ridicule, (I) was not fair, and would not reply to some of his objections, till he (the Doctor) thought proper! The meetings were about this time removed to Chatham-street Chapel, and Mr Purser continued the debate for the remainder of the fifteen nights. At the expiration of this time, he declined proceeding any longer in a very friendly letter addressed to the Doctor, in which he assured him that the resolution he had come to, of not continuing the discussion, did not proceed from any personal feelings towards the Doctor, but from a determination he had now made of separating himself for ever, as a public advocate, from Tammany Hall; and concluded with expressions of high admiration for the Doctor's abilities, &c. (Signed G. H. Purser.) This abrupt and unexpected termination of the discussion with the immediate and regularly nominated representatives of the Infidels of Tammany Hall, deprived the Doctor of the opportunity of going into the internal evidences of the authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures. The Doctor was therefore induced by the advice of his friends, and with the wish of the public to deliver a regular course of lectures on the internal evidences of the Bible, and public notice was given that at these lectures a full opportunity would be furnished to all Infidels and Sceptics to impugn any statements made by the Doctor, in his lectures, and that they might send to him in writing all questions they deemed most calculated to expose the fallacy of the Scriptures, and the strongest objections

they could possibly devise or obtain against the truth of the Sacred writings, and that he would devote an hour after each lecture, to reply publicly to those questions and objections. Moreover that any gentleman who might wish to speak or to advance his objections *à la carte* should have perfect liberty so to do. Accordingly, the Rev. Doctor Maclay's Church in Mulberry-street was obtained, (the Chatham-street Chapel having been required for some special meetings of its own congregation,) and these lectures or rather discussions commenced on Tuesday, Jan. 5th, and continued seven nights, during which time the numbers of letters containing numerous objections, many the most powerful ever advanced against the Scriptures, taken from the works of Hume, Paine, Voltaire, Gibbon, &c. were sent to the Doctor. All these he regularly and systematically answered, to the perfect satisfaction of the public. These letters with the answers to the questions therein contained will be published in their proper place. This order of the discussion terminated on Friday, January 22d, in consequence of the Doctor having been twice publicly challenged in the papers by a Mr G. Vale, teacher of Astronomy and Navigation.

This third and last order of these discussions commenced in the same place on the following Tuesday, (Mr Amos Belden was appointed Moderator by the wish of both parties) and lasted six nights, when it ended after the closest and most energetic combat for every inch of ground, (in other words, for every letter) during the whole discussion. Upon which the following resolution was regularly proposed, seconded and carried without a single dissenting voice.

Resolved "That the thanks of this meeting be presented to Dr Sleigh, for the able and efficient manner in which he has defended Christianity, and incontrovertibly proved the truth of the Sacred Scriptures, and for the important benefits that must result from the same to the moral interests of this community."

(Signed) AMOS BELDEN, Moderator. New-York, February 18th, 1836.

[Among those who approve this resolution are Browlee, McCarter, Maclays, Bangs, De Witt, Proudft, Waugh and numerous others of high theological standing.]

THE TELEGRAPH.

APRIL 21

We are indebted to brother Graves, of Ludlow, for the following extract of a

LETTER FROM BROTHER BROWN.

Calcutta, Oct. 26, 1836.

My dear brother Graves: I rejoice to hear of the zeal with which you are carrying forward the various enterprises of benevolence in America, especially in the department of Home Missions and schools in the Western states. The public mind also appears to be rapidly awakening to the awful guilt and danger of slavery. Before I left America, I saw so many evils in it that I thought it a very bad country; now I look upon it as the Paradise of the world. There is certainly no other country like it. It exhibits a grand experiment, which is to convince the world whether true religion can exist without the shackles of law, the protection of lordships, and the services of a legalized hireling priesthood.

I believe that through the blessings of God's grace, the experiment will succeed gloriously; and although infidelity and popery may for a time raise their haughty heads unbuckled, yet I believe that if true religion ever has existed upon the earth, it is to be found in America, and that it will flourish there in its purity till every species of vice and iniquity shall sink away abashed before the omnipotent and unapproachable rebukes of enlightened conscience. This is the right string to pull upon. You might frame ever so many laws for making people better, and enforce them by all the terrors of an inquisition, and it would do nothing at all towards affecting a moral renovation; but bring it home upon the conscience that such and such a practice is an *awful sin in the sight of God*, and there is no resisting it. Wicked men may for a time make a mock of it, but the irrepressible consciousness of wrong is gnawing within; and without there is a constantly increasing public sentiment, growing purer and holier from day to day, and uttering louder and louder its fearless rebukes.

I have unconsciously wandered almost to the end of my sheet without telling you any thing about our own prospects. We are in a dark land. Generations may pass before these countries shall rise up to the privileges of America. But there is a wide field for us to labor in: an open door and every encouragement. True, the native mind is not in a state to feel the grace of God has a visible and permanent effect, even upon these sunken minds. Let us then labor without fainting, believing that in due time there will be a harvest, and a glorious one, though perhaps we may never live to reap it.

The Lord bless you, my dear brother, in all your labors, and preserve you to his heavenly kingdom.

This from your unworthy brother in the bonds of the gospel.

NATHAN BROWN.

"Our readers will doubtless recollect that brother Brown was an immediate abolitionist while he edited the Telegraph. It was during his controversy with the former Jesuitical editor of the Vermont Chronicle, that our attention was first called to, and fixed upon, the doctrine of im-

mediate emancipation, as at once the demand of God, the duty of the slave-holder, and the right of the slave.—ED. TEL.

† Brother Brown has it right. There is nothing like taking hold of the conscience. Before men will leave off sinning they must be shown that they are sinners. Where there is sin to be repented of and forsaken, there must be care that the sinner be not led to view his sin as his misfortune merely. The two must not be confounded, for then you lose hold of the conscience.—ED. TEL.

✉ The editor of the Vermont Telegraph is informed that the reason we did not notice his reply, to a recent article of our touching the conduct of Mr Birney, and another gentleman, was, that his said reply was wire-drawn and evasive. The Telegraph says—

"The question concerning Mr Birney was placed before the readers of the Spectator in such a shape as in our view, to contain a most slanderous imputation, if left unanswered."

We fling back the imputation of "slanderous." What we wrote, we have been well assured is the truth. Mr Birney is not the only brawler for immediate emancipation who took care to sell his own slaves before he began thus to brawl.—*New-York Spectator.*

REMARKS.

Our readers shall judge between the editor of the Spectator and myself, as to whether of us are "evasive." He *intimated*—but without an attempt at proof, and evidently without daring to assert—that Mr Birney, sold his slaves instead of emancipating them. His *intimation* may be found on the 98th page of the Telegraph, in the shape of a question, if we mistake not precisely in his own emphatic characters. In reply to this question we testified that we heard the statement to the contrary, from Mr Birney's own lips, in public, in the city of New-York; which statement was published to the world at the time, and must have been before the eyes of the editor of the Spectator. This our plain, unequivocal, direct statement of fact, given in answer to his question—for the truth of which, we appeal to the testimony of hundreds who heard, whenever it shall be necessary for them to testify—he regards as "wire-drawn and evasive."

Now let us see where the evasiveness is. In his former paragraph, the editor of the Spectator inquired, "Now we beg leave to inquire whether Mr Birney did not sell his own slaves, AND POCKET THE MONEY, before he joined the anti-slavery society?" This interrogation we hesitated not to set down as a "most slanderous imputation." In endeavoring to get rid of this charge, what defence has he made out? Why, "What we wrote, we have been well assured is the truth." It is one thing to be "well assured;" it is quite another, and much better thing, to have the proof—to have the truth. It will require additional power to any thing here exhibited, to "fling back the imputation of 'slanderous.'" It will stick to his fingers.—Ay, it is now nailed to his forehead, and he must wear it, until such times he dare assert what we stand ready to prove to be false—viz. that Mr Birney did not emancipate his slaves. The editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser, and Spectator, "is not the only brawler" against "immediate emancipation" whose writings have been full of "slanderous imputation" ever since "he began thus to brawl."

Horrid Butchery—horrible dictum!

On the 6th of March, about midnight, Santa Ana, the Mexican commander, at the head of about 2000 men, made an assault upon the Fort at Bexar, defended by 182 Texans. So terrible was the carnage, that at daylight only 7 of the 182 were left alive in the fort. About 1000 of the Mexicans had been slaughtered.—The seven then asked for quarter, but were told by their assailants, who had raised a blood-red flag, that there was no mercy for them. They then fought until the butchery was complete. Only a woman and a wounded servant were spared. David Crockett was one of the seven.—The bodies of the slain Texans were thrown into a heap and burned.

Another War. The Comanche and Pawnee Indians, on the borders of Arkansas, have commenced war with a massacre of about 50 or 60 whites.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Brother Carpenter's query would have been attended to sooner, but we have been, and are yet, waiting to get hands on certain facts, now out of reach.

"Daleth" is under consideration.

We have several communications on hand that contain many good thoughts; but some of them are improperly arranged,

ed, others imperfectly expressed, and others still badly penned; all which would cost us much more labor than the preparation of new articles.

We are sorry to disappoint any who write for publication. Let young writers not be discouraged. They should persevere in the exercise of committing their thoughts to paper, whether they at present very frequently offer them to the publisher or not. Let some friend who can be confided in, and who is capable of judging, be consulted as to the merits of your productions.

Account of the revival in Bristol, next week.

For the Telegraph. TEETOTALISM.

Mr Editor,—I perceive by your paper of April 14th, that another society has recently been formed at Wallingford, called "The Rutland County Temperance Society." A more appropriate name I think would have been, The Rutland County Teetotal Society; for then we should not have to seek in the constitution for the object of the society. (1) I have borne my uniform testimony in favor of temperance, and am a member of a temperance society. I have watched with deep interest the progress of the cause from its incipient stages, until "a little one has become a thousand and a small one a strong nation." But, sir, the subject has at length arrived at a stage at which, ultra as I am, I find it necessary to stop and solemnly to pause. (2) So numerous, so frequent and urgent are the calls now made upon us by the various societies of the day professing benevolence, (and new ones are continually springing up) that it has become important to inquire first of all, by what authority they act, and who gave them their authority? And if their principles appear to be founded in the plain word of God, we may not oppose, although we may not choose to connect ourselves with them, or comply with their demands. (3) Of these various associations, one is that now making requisition upon all members of temperance societies to renounce, as indispensable to the continued progress and ultimate triumph of the cause, the use of the apple and the grape. (4) I shall not inquire, at this time, as to the expediency of the relinquishment of the use of either of these gifts of heaven to man. If all the joys and sufferings of this world, and all the felicities and woes of another, have been set in bold relief before the intemperate, to dissuade them from their disgusting and beastly practices, in vain, feeble indeed might the arguments be expected to prove, which might be drawn from the influence of an example in the surrender of the smallest conceivable quantity attended as it would be with little, or at most with but a proportionate degree, of self-denial in those by whom the surrender is made. Who would raise a father to oppose a tornado? (5)

Taught, as I have been, sir, by the ultraists of temperance, that the use of wine is an immorality, and never having heard the doctrine before, although my head has been whitened with the snows of more than three score winters, I have been driven to my feet, I have inquired of the former age, and prepared myself to the search of the fathers, and the result has been a conviction that holy writ does not condemn, but approve, and even command the use of wine. (6) It is in the excess (7) only in the use of any of the bounties of heaven, that the sin and evil are to be found and avoided—that changed the fruit of the vine into the "poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps." But who, sir, shall stand up and alone to affirm that the temperate, thankful use of wine, or of any of the good and perfect gifts of God, is sin, a violation of his law?

"To enjoy is to obey," says Dr Young, "and a greater than he hath said. 'Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, of them that believe and know the truth.' In the prohibition therefore of the temperate use of wine, we cannot fail to discover a departure both from the letter and spirit of the Bible; a work of supererogation, a false, fanciful, popish spirit, commanding us to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving." (8)

I have ever deeply regretted that the use of wine in the sacrament of the holy supper should have been admitted for discussion in our temperance periodicals.—In some portions of our country, if I am correctly informed, the discussion has been carried so far that individuals in many churches have suffered the cup to pass them, believing the use of wine even on that occasion to be sinful; so far from the path of safety and peace are men liable to be driven when once they leave the king's high way to follow the *ipse dixit* of weak, erring, uninspired men. (9) But the discussion of this question by mutual consent, I understand, has been discontinued in all our printed publications, and we are now told that wine may be used in the communion service. This, sir, in my humble opinion, is inconsistency rendered more inconsistent. On what ground, I ask, have these human dictators so graciously permitted the church of God to use wine on that sacred occasion, while they condemn its use in all other cases as injurious to the health, to the social, civil and religious interests of men. Convince me, sir, that in the fermented juice of the grape lies connected the deadly foe that we are told there does, and I "pledge myself that I never will take that foe with me to the house and table of the Lord, nor taste wine again on any occasion while the world shall stand." (10)

I conclude, in view of this subject, that there is nothing irreconcilable to the will

of heaven in the temperate, thankful enjoyment of the fruit of the vine tree, and the apple tree, more than of the fig tree, the olive tree, the sugar tree of our own forest, or of any of those trees of our own forest, which by their all-wise and beneficent Creator have been pronounced good, and of the fruit of which he hath given us permission freely to partake. (11)

RADIX

* Not Young, but Pope, in his Unusual Prayer.—[Ed. TEL.]

NOTES.

(1) Called by whatever name a society may be, no one ought to join it, without first reading, or hearing read, its "Constitution," and from that learning its objects—and its measures too.

(2) It is always proper and right for one to pause, when he finds himself in darkness or feels himself in danger. No matter whether the danger threaten himself or others, he should pause until he obtains light and safety, and then he should go forward. While maintaining his pause, however, he should not be idle.—If he be in darkness, let him call for light with his eyes open. If he be in danger, let him inquire for safety, ready whenever it is pointed out to him, to go forward or backward, to the right or to the left, as the case may require. He must not pause in idleness.

Why does our brother pause? He does not tell us he is in darkness, nor does he manifest consciousness of danger. Has he come to the end? Has he reached the goal? Are there no more drunkards to reform?—no more youth to rescue from the road that leads to drunkenness; from the operations of the infernal machinery that has broken and ground to dust their parents or their friends, and is reaching after and now getting hold of them? Are the wounds healed? Are the tears wiped from the eyes of the wife, the mother, the child, the widow and orphan, the brother, sister or friend? Is the cup of grief empty and removed? Is the poison label, and bail out of reach? Is hell rid of its victims? Are the nets broken and destroyed that have been used in catching the victims? Have the makers of the nets abandoned their vile employment? Has our brother done all he can afford to do—all that duty requires—all that nature and reason dictate—all that God demands, to remedy this body and soul ruining evil? If he has not, why does he pause? How long will he remain idle, while such a work and such motives are before him. Not long, we trust.

Why he should pause at this stage of the conflict, we are unable to divine, unless it be because his weapons are either "used up," or have become powerless.—Well, then, let him arm himself anew immediately, before he or any of his friends or neighbors fall into the hands of the enemy. We offer him the best armor that has yet been manufactured. It was hatched down from the arsenal of heaven. Its power is omnipotent, and yet it may be wielded by the weakest mortal. It is "Teetotalism."

(3) We wish to put the most favorable construction upon language, and are therefore unwilling to think that Radix would be willing to have us believe that he would, under any circumstances, not at liberty to stand aloof from any institution whose "principles appear to be founded in the plain word of God."

(4) No, my brother. Not the use of the apple and the grape, but of the poison that is extracted from them. Not the use of the potatoe and the rye; but of the whiskey. You are not required by the word of God, nor by any society that we are acquainted with, to reject any of the good creatures of God. The requirement is, put out of use man's self-destroying inventions. Our Creator made apples, and he made angels too. But he made neither alcohol nor devils.

(5) A father against a tornado is a very strong figure, it is allowed. The manner in which it is here introduced renders the argument, which it was designed to finish, very plausible until examined, it is also granted. But we also have a figure which we wish to place by the side of this, and leave the comparative applicableness of the two to be judged of by those who examine. A score of idle men have chosen their ground for frolicking directly over a magazine of powder. Trains of the powder have been carelessly strewed in every direction, extending to the place which we occupy. We have warned the reckless fellows of their folly and their danger, in vain. We feel ourselves to be at a safe distance. That portion of the train which reaches us is exceedingly thin. We are